COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY SERVICES MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, May 27, 1999

Council Attendees: Secretary Upson, Cheryl Clark, Ray Davis, Jan Fatouros, Chip German, Linda Harber, Patti Higgins, Joy Hughes, Pat Jackson, Pete Kolakowski, Bill Landsidle, David Molchany, Ed Morris, Lan Neugent, Mike O'Neil, Jerry Pacyna, Rick Parks, Jim Peters, Naseem Reza, Phyllis Self, Jerry Simonoff, David Sullivan, Mike Thomas.

Secretary Upson called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Linda Harber distributed a summary of recommendations for the IT Compensation and Classification Workgroup. A meeting with Secretaries Upson and Slater is being scheduled to review the recommendations. The Workgroup has worked with DPT and drafted alternative tools for IT employees modeled on the Year 2000 incentives. The package will be forwarded to Secretaries Upson and Slater for approval. The DPT/IT classification model has been revised to incorporate more efficient titles and workgroup needs. There is a two-prong way to advance as a technical person, without having to supervise employees. This model is underway at VCU, GMU and Virginia Tech and will be an option for agencies in the near future. The group hopes to advance these proposals for the Governor's 2002 budget in order to fund it for all agencies. A meeting is being scheduled with Secretaries Upson and Slater to work through the details.

Pete Kolakowski of the Seat Management Workgroup distributed a draft outline of the report to be completed in August for the Secretary and for COTS in September. The report will address how seat management works, an overview of VDOT's seat management experiment, and recommendations on an approach that could be used for the Commonwealth. Secretary Upson asked that Diane Horvath of the JCOTS Committee be briefed on the direction of the Workgroup.

David Sullivan co-chair of the State and Local Application Network Integration Workgroup explained the group has identified state agencies that have the primary goal of integrating applications with localities. The next step is to begin dialogues with the agencies that the localities need to have application interfaces. The Workgroup would have a model in place that applications could be developed and interfaced back into the state system. This would avoid double entry of information. The other area is application data sharing which is the ability for localities and possibly state agencies, to access the data that is gathered in client-server systems and begin making management decisions from the information gathered.

Secretary Upson asked that the Workgroup look at the Geographic Information System and the way data is input and used.

The Workgroup is also studying shared application development in order to develop a model where localities and other stakeholders would participate heavily in the actual development of applications that

would be used to serve customers in Virginia. This is a long-range goal to establish a new model for the development of applications that can be used by localities in providing services typically funded by or mandated by the state.

The Workgroup distributed a proposed vision statement that addresses how localities view the statewide network. The group envisions the localities participating with state agencies and with education in a statewide intranet-type model, where connectivity is based on Internet standards. There is also a need to develop standards for addressing the protocol. The final critical factor is the security aspect of such a network. The Workgroup will work with the other Workgroups to establish a vision for a single network that runs across the Commonwealth to serve localities, the state, and educational institutions. There needs to be a statewide security approach, which would allow security to fall back on the application layer and not the network.

Pete Kolakowski asked about the intra-net model and whether the Workgroup is actually referring to an extra-net which relates to the same security issues and the integration of various different platforms and applications.

Rick Parks, chair of the Gainsharing Workgroup, presented a recommendation for the Council's approval on the formulation of web-site services to facilitate the sharing of information among state agencies and local governments. The recommendation is to create a partnership with the L-GOV organization and COTS. It will assist state agencies and local governments in sharing information with a COTS Gainsharing link on its website. L-GOV will establish and maintain a private list serve for state agencies and local governments and will maintain a public domain library.

Secretary Upson was in approval of moving forward on the Workgroup's recommendation. They will come back to the Council with procedures to utilize the website.

Cheryl Clark, chair of Privacy, Security and Access Workgroup discussed the group's focus on legal framework, questions about adequacy and common practices among state agencies and institutions. The group is exploring the issue of balancing the convenience of access as well as security and protection of privacy. There is also interest in the ability to effectively manage and promote transition to Internet and E-commerce and agencies doing business on the Web. The group is focusing primarily on Internet/ Intranet/Extranet as its first priority then on other platforms and technologies as those connect. The workgroup has commissioned four working documents: first, to develop a model of the operative legal framework within the Commonwealth context; second, to develop a model of Internet risks and countermeasures – to include tools, techniques, standards and architecture; third, to develop a framework to show categories of information common across agencies and to obtain recommended levels of protection for each category; and fourth, to develop a workgroup charter.

Bill Landsidle asked about the proper place for the issue of digital certificates to be addressed. He recommends the state have a statewide policy on digital certificates.

Mike Thomas commented that the Commonwealth should have a statewide framework for digital certificates in order to more forward in a coordinated fashion.

Secretary Upson asked Cheryl Clark to arrange for someone to make a presentation at the next COTS meeting on digital certificates and best practices other states have adopted or are following.

Jerry Simonoff, chair of the Organizational Workgroup talked about enterprise architecture and the importance of clearly defining how the state can integrate business processes and truly bring about web-enabled government for the citizens who will use these applications. The workgroup is focusing on architecture that is truly enterprise-significant and several vendors have offered assistance and will be forthcoming with advice.

Jan Fatouros of the Procurement Workgroup presented two recommendations; first, the IT Procurement Committee Organization Responsibilities. The objective is to provide a committee whose members have the authority to determine priorities, delegate purchases, approve the release of solicitations and administer contracts. The committee will include directors of Information Technology, Technology Planning and Purchases and Supply. The committee should recommend to COTS, for approval, a list of technology procurement priorities and assignments. It would let the committee know what it needs to be worked on and how quickly, establish a schedule for those state contract procurements, act as a coordinator for the circulation and the evaluation of comments on solicitations.

Mr. Thomas expressed concern about the legal posture of the recommendation on "provide guidance on decisions during contract negotiations." It may potentially establish grounds for someone to protest an award. He suggested there might be a better way to frame the recommendation. Mr. Thomas also raised concern under the "objective". He recommended it read "whose members have direct input into the determination of priorities, the delegation of purchases and release, etc."

Mr. Simonoff raised concern of a potential contradiction between the objective and the roles of the committee.

Ms. Fatouros stressed the importance of having technology people readily available to assist buyers in dealing with contract negotiations, especially with RFP's that are open-ended.

Mr. Thomas suggested one specific body be assigned to contract negotiations to help coordinate input into the front end of the contracting process. This group could work with agencies to supply personnel from the appropriate agency to be part of the Selection Committee.

Ms. Fatouros was in agreement that this body become an organized group because of their position in the Commonwealth and their ability to commit resources. The Workgroup would not have a problem striking the words "guidance and decisions on contract negotiations" from their recommendations as long as the process actually takes place. The words "have the authority" can also be replaced with "whose members determine priorities, delegate purchases, approve the release of solicitations and

administer contracts" if it alleviates Mr. Simonoff's concerns.

Ms. Hughes suggested removing the section called "objective" from the recommendations and use a "COTS Procurement and Planning Committee" which clearly shows the committee is making recommendations to COTS and asking for approval of a list of priorities. She also recommended changing "provide guidance and decisions during contract negotiations" to "commit resources when asked by the approved procurement agencies during contract negotiations."

Mr. Thomas was in agreement with this change and incorporating the other sentence he suggested.

Ms. Fatouros suggested the last line should read "commit resources when requested by purchasing organization" instead of the language "provide guidance and decisions".

Dan Ziomek presented a recommendation entitled "Electronic Procurement Demonstration." The workgroup is proposing that the Council support and promote electronic demonstrations that focus on the recommendations of JSR 36, #2-6. The focus is on a web-enabled procurement site addressing small purchases and later expanded to include other types of procurements. It was be a single site where anyone doing business with the state would go to; a central vendor registration; a central site which state agencies and other organizations could visit to find needed commodities. The initial demonstration would focus on IT procurement commodities and services. The group would like seed money that is available in the Virginia technology infrastructure to get started in the coming fiscal year. The group would start with a demonstration and once the infrastructure is in place and the website is established, then the group can quickly cover all commodities.

Mr. Landsidle was in agreement of this kind of a pilot for using a procurement card over the Internet. It would be useful for small purchases of $200-300 to demonstrate the security and precision that takes place. It would build the level of confidence statewide about the use of this particular technology as well as alleviate concerns of purchasing officials and fiscal officers across the state agencies.

Mr. Ziomek stressed the demonstration is to show all agencies across the state that this is a good way to do business; that it's more efficient and more cost-effective and the right direction to proceed.

Mr. Landsidle stressed the need for business processes that everyone has developed and agreed to. The state does not have a set of procedures that provide adequate protection to both the Commonwealth and the people that are buying on behalf of the Commonwealth and it is the direction we need to follow.

Secretary Upson expressed concern of using the term "demonstration" in regard to this project. This process is taking place throughout the United States and he is ready for Virginia to move forward. He does not want Virginia to be last in taking hold of this technology.

Mr. Ziomek hopes to present the project in full detail at a future COTS meeting. He emphasized that the project will need resources to implement.

Secretary Upson recessed the business portion of the COTS meeting.